

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated June 2, 2010, the Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and on the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 5-19, and 21 are pending in this application, with independent claim 21 being newly presented. Claims 4 and 20 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

### **Rejection of Claims under § 102 (e)**

Claims 1-3 and 5-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0186827 to Griffiths.

These claims, though, are not anticipated by *Griffiths*. These claims already recite, or incorporate, features that distinguish over *Griffiths*. Independent claim 1, for example, recites “receiving a call routed from a dialed number in a native transport network to a virtual telephone number in a service-providing network” (emphasis added). The Office asserts that *Griffiths* discloses these features, and the Office specifically cites to a Service Control Point (or SCP) described in *Griffiths*.

The Office, though, is mistaken. The Office has, very respectfully, misinterpreted *Griffiths*. When *Griffiths* is correctly interpreted, claims 1-3 and 5-19 are not anticipated by *Griffiths*.

The Office, for example, cites to *Griffiths*'s paragraphs [0053] and [0113] - [0114], which are reproduced below.

[0053] **When a caller using telephone 131 places a call to a subscriber** using a cellular phone 220, an **SSP 30 sends an AIN (Advanced Intelligent Network) query to SCP 90 via an SS7 Network 20. SCP 90 then communicates with HLR 240 via SS7 Networks 20 and 270. HLR 240 stores information about the subscriber, such as the subscriber's location. Once the**

**subscriber is located, HLR 240 responds to the SCP 90**, which sends the appropriate SSP 30 the information necessary to connect the caller to the subscriber's cellular phone 220. The incoming call is routed from the SSP 30, which is connected to the caller's end office 120, through the PSTN 10 to the MSC 200. The MSC 200 locates the cellular subscriber's cellular phone 220 using information obtained from the HLR 240 and routes the incoming call to the appropriate base station 210. The base station 210 converts the landline signal of the incoming call to a cellular signal, and transmits the incoming call to the subscriber's cellular phone 220.

[0113] In a call flow scenario of the PSTN 10, an embodiment of a CAS SPA 95 implementation of the present invention proceeds as follows: A caller, using telephone 130A, dials a subscriber on telephone 130B. When the SSP 30 associated with subscriber telephone 130B detects a trigger associated with the incoming call, the SSP 30 associated with subscriber telephone 130B launches an AIN (Advanced Intelligent Network) query. **An AIN query begins with a Transaction Capability Application Part (TCAP) query message that is sent via a Transactional Manager (TM) subsystem 35 within the SSP 30 to the SCP 90 by way of an STP 40 and the SS7 control network 20.**

[0114] The STP 40 receives the TCAP query message, and then **translates the subscriber's address to determine the correct SCP 90 address** and the appropriate Service Package Application for processing the AIN service request. In this case, the CAS SPA 95 is the appropriate Service Application Package. **The STP 40 reformulates and forwards the TCAP message to the appropriate SCP 90 over the SS7 network.** The SCP 90 creates a routing key from the TCAP message and passes the routing key information along to the CAS SPA 95. The CAS SPA 95 uses the routing key to identify the subscriber of the call administration service (i.e., the called party).

See U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0186827 to Griffiths at [0053] & [0113] - [0114] (emphasis added). The Office interprets the above-described TCAP and translation (e.g., the “STP 40 receives the TCAP query message, and then translates the subscriber’s address to determine the correct SCP 90 address”) as the claimed “*receiving a call routed from a dialed number in a native transport network to a virtual telephone number in a service-providing network*” (emphasis added).

This interpretation is incorrect. The translation described in *Griffiths*'s paragraph [0114] obtains a server address, not a “*virtual telephone number*,” as the independent claims recite. As *Griffiths* explains:

**The SCP 90 is a server** and an associated database, SCP storage 98. The SCP 90 interfaces with the SSP network element 30 **via the SS7 network 20**, and translates SSP 30 Transaction Capabilities Applications Protocol (TCAP) queries into routing instructions for the SSP 30.

See U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0186827 to Griffiths at [0109] (emphasis added). As *Griffiths* also explains, “[t]he **SS7 network 20 is a packet switching network**, which uses Signaling Transfer Point (STP) 40 elements to transfer SS7 messages used for management and control of the PSTN 10.” See U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0186827 to Griffiths at [0107] (emphasis added). *Griffiths*'s Service Control Point thus translates a server address in the packet switching SS7 network, not a “*virtual telephone number*,” as the independent claims recite. The Office has thus, very respectfully, misinterpreted *Griffiths*.

Claims 1-3 and 5-19, then, cannot be anticipated by *Griffiths*. The independent claims recite many features that are not disclosed or suggested by *Griffiths*. Their respective dependent claims incorporate these same features and recite additional features. These claims, then, cannot be anticipated, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 102 (e) rejection of these claims.

### **New Claim 21**

This response presents new independent claim 21. New independent claim 21 replaces independent claim 20, which was previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Independent claim 21 recites features that are similar to independent claim 1, so new independent claim 21 must distinguish over *Griffiths*.

No excess claim fee is due. Because new independent claim 21 replaces canceled claim 20, the number of independent claims is three (3). The number of pending claims is less than twenty (20). No excess claim fee is thus due.

---

If any questions arise, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or [scott@scottzimmerman.com](mailto:scott@scottzimmerman.com).

**37 C.F.R. § 1.8 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted via the USPTO EFS web interface on September 1, 2010.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Scott P. Zimmerman', is written over a series of horizontal lines.

Scott P. Zimmerman  
Attorney for the Assignee  
Reg. No. 41,390